## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4 THOUGHT, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORACLE CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. <u>12-cv-05601-WHO</u> (MEJ)

**DISCOVERY ORDER** 

Re: Dkt. No. 109

The Court is in receipt of the parties' joint discovery dispute letter, filed July 30, 2014. Dkt. No. 109. The dispute concerns Oracle's objections to 39 of Thought Inc.'s 87 requests for production of documents and 4 of Thought's 18 interrogatories. Upon review of the parties' positions, the Court finds that Thought's requests appear to be overbroad and Oracle would be unduly burdened if required to produce all documents in response. However, the parties do not address specific requests and have not provided the requests for the Court's review. Further, based on the parties' attestation, it appears that Oracle is willing to meet and confer on the full scope of Thought's requests as they relate to Thought's list of accused products. Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS the parties to further meet and confer in person to determine if they are able to narrow the scope of Thought's requests and agree upon a more limited production. Thought is advised that the Court is unlikely to require further production if its requests remain overbroad, such as requiring source code for Oracle's application and database products where Oracle has produced other documents and source code that provide the necessary information for its case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 31, 2014

MARIA-ELENA JAMES United States Magistrate Judge

25

26

\_\_

2728